

Baucus-Tester-Collins-Leahy amendment to strip the references to the problematic REAL ID program from the underlying immigration bill. We may agree or disagree about the merits of the actual REAL ID program, but as hearings in the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee have shown, REAL ID is far from being ready for prime time.

While the Department of Homeland Security has not even released final regulations directing the States on REAL ID implementation, REAL ID licenses are rapidly becoming a de facto national ID card, since you will need one to enter courthouses, airports, Federal buildings, and—if this bill passes—workplaces all across the country. With roughly 260 million drivers in this country, I do not see how we could have the massive national databases required by REAL ID and this immigration bill up and running by the 2013 deadline set in this bill. Moreover, REAL ID raises multiple constitutional issues whose legal challenges could delay final implementation for years.

In addition to numerous privacy and civil liberties concerns, REAL ID is a massive drivers' tax that could cost Americans taxpayers more than \$23 billion. Opposition spans the political spectrum, from the right to the left, and a large number of States have expressed concerns about the mandates of the REAL ID Act by enacting bills and resolutions that oppose REAL ID. Georgia, Washington, Oklahoma, Montana, South Carolina, Maine, and New Hampshire have gone so far as to pass binding legislation that says they intend to refuse to comply with REAL ID. The National Conference of State Legislatures and the National Governors Association have expressed serious reservations about the costs imposed on the States—and the structure of the poorly drafted grant program in the underlying bill. The Center for Democracy and Technology and the ACLU have expressed serious concerns about the lack of privacy and civil liberties protections within the REAL ID program. The reaction to the unfunded mandates and lack of privacy standards in the REAL ID Act is a good example of what happens when the Federal Government imposes a unilaterally devised and ill-considered mandate rather than working to meet goals through cooperation, bipartisanship, and partnership.

For any new immigration measures to be effective, they must be well designed. Forcing employers, employees, and the States to use this troublesome national ID card will slow down the hiring process, stifle commerce, and not serve as an effective strategy. In addition, the States have already told us that they will not all have their new license programs up and running by the 2013 deadline called for in this bill. On top of that, I have gone through this bill several times, and I have found

money for border fences, money for surveillance technologies, money for border patrol agents, and money for detention facilities, but I cannot find any hard money that actually goes into REAL ID implementation. So doing away with this poorly drafted grant program will not take \$1 away from the \$4.4 billion in enforcement money contained in this bill.

As a result, I do not believe that we should jeopardize the future success of the immigration reforms sought in this bill by tying REAL ID too closely to it. Instead of mandating REAL ID licenses for employment verification, I think we should support the Baucus-Tester-Collins-Leahy amendment to strip REAL ID from this bill and put together a workable employment verification system that does not needlessly burden every legal job seeker in this country with the onerous and problematic requirements of REAL ID. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend from South Dakota wishes to speak. I have a unanimous consent request I wish to make that will put us into a situation where he can speak. I understand he wants to speak for 5 minutes. This will only take a minute, and then I will be recognized to do some other business we have to do tonight. It is nothing in relation to immigration. No one need worry about that.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2007

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Thursday June 28; that on Thursday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1639, the immigration bill, with an hour for debate only prior to a cloture vote on S. 1639, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and SPECTER or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture; that Members have until 10 a.m. to file any germane second-degree amendments; and that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, wishes to be recognized. Is the Senator going to use the full 10 minutes? He is entitled to it.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I shouldn't take that long. I guess maybe 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his indulgence. I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak to the issue before the Senate today.

The debate over immigration has been a contentious one. Soon we are going to come to that moment of truth when we all have the opportunity to cast a vote either for or against the so-called "grand bargain" that is before the Senate. Most of us are going to make that vote formed by our own experiences, formed by our conscience, formed by our constituents, and like so many others in this Chamber, those are all factors that come into play and influence the way that I view this very important and serious issue.

In fact, to speak to some of the experiences I have had, it was not too long ago I was in a supermarket in my home State of South Dakota in Sioux Falls. I was approached by someone who was working there who had asked me to help with a problem. It turns out he was in this country, and his wife had been here illegally. They had a child here. The child, therefore, is a citizen. His wife determined that she wanted to be legal. So she left this country and went back home and decided to come here through a legal mechanism. That was a year ago. For the past year, she has been trying to come back to this country legally. I have been working with her. They have to first get an immigrant waiver and then ultimately go through the process where she can come into this country and come legally.

I make that point because I believe it is very relevant to the debate we are having on the floor of the Senate. If this woman who wanted to do the right thing and decided to go back because she wanted to come into the United States of America legally—she didn't want to be here illegally—had just stayed here, under this bill, she could become legalized. What does that say to all the people such as her who are trying to follow the laws, who are trying to play by the rules we have created?

That is one episode, one example, as I look at this debate and think about the consequences for those who have played by the rules, those who follow our laws, those who observe the rule of law in America, how it forms the way I view this issue.

We have been told throughout this debate that this is the best compromise